UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/197,475	11/23/98	NAGASHIMA T	35.C13131

005514 WM31/0705
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER	
CARTER, T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2622	8

DATE MAILED: 07/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/197,475	NAGASHIMA, TAKEYUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tia A Carter	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Manglapus et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6219151).

Regarding claim [**1**], Manglapus et al. discloses a printer server for receiving a printing job from a terminal and transferring the job to an output device (column 3, lines 57-68; column 4, lines 1-13), comprising:

Recording means for storing the correction data corresponding to the output characteristics of said output device (Fig. 1, column 5, lines 10-31); and

Correction means for correcting said printing said printing job on the basis of said correction data (Fig. 1, column 5, lines 40-65).

Regarding claim [**2**], Manglapus et al. discloses the printer server according claim 1, wherein said correction data is updated by performing two-way communication with said output device (Fig.3, column 7, lines 1-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manglapus et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6219151) in view of Konishi (U.S. Pat. No. 6046820).

Regarding claim [**3**], Manglapus et al. does not disclose the limitations cited "correction data is generated when said output device executes calibration on the basis of a state parameter".

Konishi discloses the printer server according to claim 2, wherein said correction data is generated when said output device executes calibration on the basis of a state parameter (Fig. 1, column 3, lines 40-55).

Based on the disclosure the "state parameter" is the environmental conditions and removal of components of a printer, e.g. electrophotographic printer. The reference used discloses these functions cited above and in (Fig. 2, column 4, lines 27-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Manglaous et al. in that the conditions of the output device

such as those disclosed would be taken into consideration while executing calibration before correcting the specified data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Konishi and Manglapus et al. to acquire the limitations disclosed in claim 3.

Regarding claim [**4**], Manglapus et al. discloses the printer server data processing method for receiving a printing job from a terminal and transferring said printing job to an output device (Fig. 1, column 4, lines 22-45), comprising the step of:

Manglapus et al. **does not disclose** a correcting said printing job on the basis of the correction data corresponding to the output characteristic of said out put device to be stored.

Konishi **discloses** correcting said printing job on the basis of the correction data corresponding to the output characteristic of said out put device to be stored (Fig. 2,column 4, lines 22-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Manglapus et al. wherein the print job error has a correction process, in that preventing an overflow of the output system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Konishi and Manglapus et al. to acquire the limitations disclosed in claim 4.

Regarding claim [**5**], Manglapus et al. discloses the printer-server data processing method according to claim 4, wherein said correction data is updated by performing two-way communication with said output device (Fig.3, column 7, lines 1-19).

Regarding claim [**6**], Manglapus et al. **does not disclose** the limitations cited "correction data is generated when said output device executes calibration on the basis of a state parameter", however, he does disclose the printer-server data processing method according to claim 5.

Konishi **discloses** wherein said correction data is generated when said output device executes calibration on the basis of a state parameter (Fig. 1, column 3, lines 40-55).

Based on the disclosure the "state parameter" is the environmental conditions and removal of components of a printer, e.g. electrophotographic printer. The reference used discloses these functions cited above and in (Fig. 2, column 4, lines 27-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Manglaous et al. in that the conditions of the output device such as those disclosed would be taken into consideration while executing calibration before correcting the specified data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Konishi and Manglapus et al. to acquire the limitations disclosed in claim 6.

5. Claim 7 –9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Konishi (U.S. Pat. No. 6046820).

Regarding claim [**7**], Konishi discloses a storage medium (Fig. 1,column 3, lines 16-26) storing a program which can be read by a computer for controlling a printer server for receiving a printing job from a terminal and outputting the printing job to an output device (Fig.1, column 3, lines 1-5), comprising the step of:

Correcting said printing job on the basis of the correction data corresponding to the output characteristic of said output device to be stored (Fig. 2, column 4, lines 22-52).

Regarding claim [**8**], Konishi discloses the storage medium storing a program that can be read by a computer according to claim 7, wherein said correction data is updated by performing two-way communication (Fig. 1, column 3, lines 41-55).

Regarding claim [**9**], Konishi discloses the storage medium storing a program that can be read by a computer according to claim 7, wherein said correction data is generated when said output device executes calibration on the basis of a state parameter (Fig. 1, column 3, lines 40-55).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yamada (6188486), Arkawa (5845076), Gotoh (6222635), Takashima (6219148) and Kimura (6226097) are cited to show related art with respect to output apparatus communication and information storage mediums. Kageyama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5625757) is cited to show related with respect to a printing system connected to plural apparatus with varies printing queries and functions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tia A Carter whose telephone number is 703 - 306-5433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-6036 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-6056.

Tia A Carter
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

TAC
July 2, 2001